HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 10 Wednesday, March 11, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

SPENDING: *Rockefeller's fading star* ..... (page 1)

National tax revolt brewing? .... (page 1)

Ike vs. *housing bill* ..... (page 1)

DULLES: *A new "liberal" maneuver* ..... (page 2)

SCHOOLS: *Private education meets the test* .. (page 3)

The Rockefeller Reversal: Wherever the party professionals (Democratic or Republican) gather in the Nation's Capital, the talk today revolves around the big political development of recent weeks—the reversal of Governor Nelson Rockefeller's posture in the national scene.

Three months ago, Rockefeller occupied a commanding place among those cited as likely to win the Presidential election in 1960. At that time, the irresistible force of his "personality" was rated as a decisive element in the coming contest for power. Today, the pros studying the details of Rockefeller's sudden fall place major emphasis on the revolt of the taxpayer as the factor overriding infectious grins, ingested blintzes and warm handshakes.

What particularly rivets the attention of GOP politicos is not the fact that national polls show Rocky's decline, but the mounting evidence that the Governor is fast losing the mob on the New York sidewalks which swept him to victory in November.

Such evidence includes the following items: (1) *The scene in New York's Coliseum, February 20, when Governor Rockefeller received such a booing from New Yorkers that he had to beg his auditors to listen to his apologia. The New York* World-Telegram *reported (February 21) that the Governor "was wildly and steadily booed last night by upward of 5000 persons."*

(2) The tidal wave of mail received by legislators in Albany—in a ratio of 100-to-one—protesting the Governor's tax program and frequently expressing a determination never to vote again for Rockefeller.

(3) *Hence, there has appeared the profile of a recently masterful Governor, now yielding day by day to increasingly rebellious members of his party, bent on cutting his big spending budget.*

Scanning all such signs and portents, the pros here in Washington conclude that Rockefeller has—at least temporarily—lost control of his party in New York. This conclusion carries ominous overtones for 1960: If he can't control his own party in his own state, what chance has he to win the country in November, 1960? And, if this picture becomes clearer, what chance has he for winning the Presidential nomination in the Republican convention? Hence, many GOP politicos are beginning to say: "He's a nice fellow, but he can't be elected President."

Newsmen deem significant what the Democratic pros were saying quietly in the corridors of Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel last week, during the big Democratic $100 a plate dinner. They said that Rockefeller had slipped badly; they predicted the nomination of Vice President Nixon to succeed Eisenhower; and they conceded—very privately—that Nixon would be the hardest Republican to beat.

Not Merely Gossip: When Senator Bridges last week indignantly demanded the curtailment of all foreign aid to Bolivia (where a mob attacked our Embassy), he was moved by knowledge that since 1953 the US has given aid to that republic amounting to $50 for each of its citizens.

● Capitol Hill is convinced that President Eisenhower will veto the $5.8 billion housing bill which the Democratic leadership is pushing through Congress. And Republican leaders believe that they will have enough votes to sustain the veto.

● Conservatives in the GOP are boosting Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield as successor to Meade Alcorn, Chairman of the Republican National Committee. They were impressed by his recent conservative speech in New York; they recall that, as National Chairman in October 1952, he persuaded Ike, over the advice of Sherman Adams, to keep Richard M. Nixon as Vice Presidential candidate; and finally, that he has a wide acquaintance among the rank and file of the party throughout the country.

Revolt Against Spending: From Maine to the Pacific Coast an insurrection is under way against big spending by local and Federal Government.

In the state of Maine, Democratic Governor Clinton A. Clauson, elected in his party's sweep last fall, started the new session with ambitious proposals for giving away the taxpayers' money. The constituents soon let him know their desire is for economy. Today the Democratic Governor and the GOP legislature are vying with each other with plans for paring state expenditures.

According to press reports, an avalanche of mail has been pouring into state legislators' offices in Olympia, Washington, protesting the $2 billion budget of Democratic Governor Albert Rossellini.

Associate Editor Ross Cunningham of the Seattle "Times" analyzed the mail as follows: "The letters show a depth of understanding of the relation of spending to taxation. Unlike most tax-protest letters . . . the signers of these declare that they will be content with Government services at present levels.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"This is a little disturbing to some officials, as they usually attempt to justify their march to higher taxes by asserting they are meeting a demand from the public for a higher level of services. The protest letters tend to undermine this contention."

In the Nation's Capital, Congressman Russell Mack (R.-Wash.) comments: "A grass-roots revolt has started in the State of Washington against excessive and extravagant spending by the state and Federal Governments. I received 344 letters this morning from citizens of my district urging less extravagant spending by Congress and demanding that no new state or Federal taxes be levied on taxpayers. Press reports from my state report our Governor has received 10,000 of these taxpayers' revolt letters. Other Congressmen from my state have been flooded with these taxpayer revolt letters."

Water is being poured on this wheel by economy-minded organizations in the Evergreen State—such as the Taxpayers' Protective Association and the Citizens Council for Good Government. One device used by interested groups is to circulate petitions demanding that big spending be halted.

Meanwhile, in New York City, a bipartisan group of civic-minded personalities—according to the grapevine—has organized and is preparing a campaign of newspaper advertisements calling for economy in state and Federal Government. The theme of these ads will be the necessity of a "sound dollar." In the Capital, a White House spokesman last week remarked that such a campaign would be "highly desirable and effective."

Inside State Department: The word has gone round on Capitol Hill: watch for a well-orchestrated drive by "liberal" columnists for the appointment of Ambassador (to the Philippines) Charles "Chip" Bohlen to the White House as special adviser on relations with Soviet Russia, to "help" ailing Secretary Dulles.

This expected propaganda move would presumably boost Bohlen as one of our greatest official experts on Russia, because he speaks Russian and served as Ambassador in Moscow. The "liberals" obviously want Bohlen because he has played their game for years. But Washington recalls how Senators Taft and Bridges in 1953 strenuously opposed naming of Bohlen to be Ambassador to Moscow.

They reminded the White House that Bohlen had served as the principal State Department expert on Eastern Europe in the great sellout at the Yalta conference. The noxious results of this diplomatic debacle—designed by Bohlen and executed by Roosevelt—still hang heavy over all of Europe.

Why was Bohlen yanked out of his post in Moscow two years ago and sent to Manila? Insiders in the State Department say that Dulles held against Bohlen the fact that the latter sold Ike on making a big play for the friendship of Marshal Zhukov, who emerged a Russian military hero from the last war, and whom Ike had known in Berlin in 1945. Bohlen hailed Zhukov as the coming ruler of Russia. Billed by his "liberal" admirers as one of the experts who has always "been right" on Russia, Bohlen is said to have advised the President to start the latter's well-publicized correspondence with Zhukov. All that followed the exchange was that the Kremlin demoted Zhukov, who has now completely disappeared from the Russian scene. (Whether he is alive or not remains a question.)

The "liberal" claque, it is expected, naturally will not mention other official experts on Soviet Russia: such as Under Secretary of State Loy Henderson, who also speaks Russian and who has a longer and more intimate knowledge of Russo-American diplomatic relations than Bohlen; nor the present Ambassador to Poland, Jacob D. Beam, who also speaks Russian and has a long background knowledge of Soviet Russia; nor retired Ambassador John C. Wiley, who speaks Russian and has a long knowledge of Eastern European affairs. The list could be extended.

The anticipated maneuver by the "liberals" of course, would represent an effort by the appeasers in the press and their friends in the Administration to weaken the tenacious hold which Secretary Dulles has kept on the direction of policy *vis-a-vis* the Soviets.

Labor Front: Further incisive comment is being heard on "Sweetheart II," Senator John Kennedy's wrist-slapping labor-reform bill, now before the Senate. Scoring Kennedy's bill last month was Utah's conservative senior Senator, Wallace Bennett, a co-sponsor, with Senator Goldwater and others, of the GOP labor bill this session.

Kennedy, upon presenting his bill to the Senate claimed—in a much-publicized utterance—that it would "virtually put Mr. Hoffa and his associates out of business." Bennett exposed the falseness of this assertion.

Kennedy's bill, he noted, "exempts from regulation locals with less than 200 members. That means that nothing would be done about the 'paper locals' which have enabled hoodlums to control the Teamsters Union. The bill relies heavily upon compliance with union constitutions. But more than half of the Teamster locals don't even have constitutions and by-laws!"

"Far from 'putting Jimmy Hoffa out of business,'" Bennett concluded, "the Kennedy bill would fall far short of correcting the evils brought out by the McClellan committee."

Depressed Areas: Some unwilling Senators last week fidgeted through ten minutes of basic economics, as the American Farm Bureau Federation—America's largest farmer organization—weighed in with a deftly worded protest against the big-spending "depressed areas" bill now being pushed by Senator Paul Douglas (D.-Ill.) and other "liberal" Democrats (see "Another 'Liberal' Patent Medicine," by Frank Chodorov, in HUMAN EVENTS for March 4, 1959).

Testifying for the Farm Bureau, witness George Doup laid bare the essential fallacy of the "area redevelopment" boondoggle:

"The apparent assumption behind proposals for Federal action is that the problem of attracting industry to depressed areas is a problem of finding the requisite funds. We submit, to the contrary, that private funds are available if economically sound opportunities exist. A de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressed area is one suffering from some economic cause or consequence. An infusion of Federal funds may only delay facing up to the underlying problem."

Doup also observed that "to tax people to create public funds to lend for industrial development is not the most efficient way to accomplish [the desired] objectives. This does not create more capital, it only diverts it from other purposes."

Such an approach to "redevelopment," he concluded, runs "the risk of freezing capacity in uneconomic patterns and locations. This inevitably involves wastes which reduce total productive capacity. Any improvement in the productive capacity of an area in response to Federal subsidy . . . is likely to be at the cost of comparable development in other and more economic locations."

Private Schools: Evidence that a private educational system can effectively replace the public schools emanated recently from Front Royal, Virginia.

Front Royal's large (1,000 pupils) school was closed down six months ago when it came under Court order to integrate. The white pupils were then placed in private classes set up in downtown Front Royal, which they have been attending ever since. Last month, the court ordered the school to re-open and admit 22 Negro students seeking entrance. Front Royal complied, the school reopened, the Negroes entered. But there was no integration. because none of the school's 800 former pupils showed up. They all continued to attend their private classes.

The reasons behind this startling development, reported the Washington *Post,* reflect upon the effectiveness of Front Royal's private educational system:

"Some white pupils," the *Post* related, "said it was a student boycott. But school officials and teachers in the private schools said otherwise. They claimed no white children showed up because parents did not want their children's education, interrupted once by the school closing, interrupted again by its opening."

The fact that not even one white parent rushed to return his child to the allegedly superior teaching of the public schools goes far to puncture the "liberal" theory that the South faces a choice between segregation on the one hand, adequate education on the other.

Frank Chodorov, author of numerous studies on private *vs.* public schooling, offered this comment last week: "It is obvious that the students, particularly those who contemplate college, are quite satisfied that the system instituted under pressure has proven itself adequate for their needs. Certainly, no boy bent on going to college would continue at a school which did not properly prepare him for entrance. It is this consequence that HUMAN EVENTS predicted, long before the *Brown* decision, in an article called 'A Solution for the Public School System,' December 2, 1953.

"The argument then was that if a certain number of local communities decided to take recourse to private schooling, then the superior education would downgrade public schools in the estimation of parents. The bickering over 'progressivism' would thus disappear, and a shifting of a considerable school population to private schools would ease a fiscal problem of the states and communities. If the Front Royal experiment spreads, in the wake of Virginia's abolition of compulsory attendance, school taxes will have to be dropped, thus enabling parents to pay for the education of their children."

Subversion: Anti-Communist legislative recommendations recently made by the powerful American Bar Association are bearing fruit at an early date. A bill introduced by Representative Francis E. Walter (D.-Pa.) to plug a Smith Act loophole—through which the Supreme Court in 1957 pushed more than a dozen Communists—was unanimously passed by the House last week.

The bill defines the term "organize," as used in the Smith Act (prohibiting advocacy of the violent overthrow of the Government), as referring to "recruitment of new members, forming of new units, and regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes and other units" in Communist organizations. In past decisions, the Court ruled that Congress had not meant to classify such activities as criminal when it wrote the term "organize" into the Smith Act.

Reds in Latin America: In the outbursts of violence last week in Bolivia and Columbia, Washington sees further evidence that communism is expanding rapidly in Latin America. The pattern of subversion (along with propaganda attacks, as in the case of the Dominican Republic) has appeared repeatedly—in Guatemala, Cuba, Venezuela—and now in two other Latin nations.

Moreover, Representative Daniel Flood (D.-Pa.) recently called attention to Communist threats to a vital link in the US communications system—the Panama Canal. Flood declared that Red influence was behind the current Panamanian demand to alter the rights on territorial waters affecting access to the Canal. "Those in charge of the Communist movement in Latin America," he said, "and especially in the Caribbean area, have undoubtedly focussed their conspiratorial activities on the Panama Canal with the purpose of causing destruction of amicable relations between the United States and Panama, with complete liquidation of United States control over the Canal itself."

Farm Front: Under the impact of rough handling by the Federal bureaucracy, an American farmer last month announced his intention of leaving the United States. Poultry farmer Stanley Yankus, of Dowagiac, Michigan, will escape the tyranny of the Government's agricultural support-control system by migrating to Australia. Over the years, the Government has assessed Yankus $4500 in fines for not observing the "wheat quota," even though he has never accepted any Government subsidy, and has never contracted to take part in the price-support program. "They merely guess how many bushels of wheat I grew on the 35 to 45 acres I planted each year," Yankus said. "One year they doubled what I really grew and fined me on that basis. This year they told me how much wheat I had before I had harvested a single grain, and they fined me before I entered the field.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It's infuriating to be earning a living on your own farm rather than letting other taxpayers support you and then be told you're not a good citizen and that those who live off handouts are."

Explaining his plan to move to Australia, Yankus remarked: "I don't expect it to be perfect there, but I know they haven't got this foreign aid stuff."

Washington and the Press: A number of HUMAN EVENTS subscribers have complained about the left-wing bias among prominent newspapers. By way of explaining this condition, the following excerpt from a television broadcast entitled "Washington and the Press" may be helpful. The broadcast is from a series of programs produced by WGBH-TV in Massachusetts, with a grant from the Fund for the Republic. Louis Lyons (curator of the Nieman journalism fellowships at Harvard) interviewed James Reston, chief of the Washington Bureau of *The New York Times*.

"*Reston*: . . . Of course, it has been perfectly obvious for a long time that the press of this country is more partial to the Republican Administration than it would be to a Democratic Administration."

"*Lyons*: We are all conscious of Adlai Stevenson's 1952 needling of a one-party press.

"*Reston*: Yes, but the point I was trying to make concerned reporters, and you shouldn't, I think, equate reporters with the press. The institutional ownership of the press may be biased toward the side of the Republicans, but I think the Republicans are always complaining of precisely the opposite bias by the reporters. The reporters tend to lean the other way; indeed, in some ways, they usually tend to lean against the wind, even against their own publishers.

"*Lyons*: And they get away with this and usually get adequate backing from their publishers?

"*Reston*: I think they do, yes."

Reston did not mention editorial writers, but observers here believe this class share the same attitude as reporters.

Time magazine put the situation more sharply (April 16, 1956): "If the owners and publishers of US newspapers constitute a force for the GOP, there is another, more effective, 'one party' Democratic press: The Washington press corps. An estimated 85 per cent of the correspondents in the Capital, conditioned in the Depression and under the New Deal, have political reflexes that respond favorably to Democrats, unfavorably to Republicans. They strengthen their reflexes daily by reading the *Washington Post*, where their reactions are shared by the *Post's* top brass."

Who Likes Whom: Some notes on back-scratching among members of the near and far left wing:

● The National Education Association, through a department, the Association for Higher Education, last week staged a conference on college education. Featured at this conclave of the NEA, supposedly a nonpartisan group: Senator Hubert Humphrey, ADAer and left-wing Democrat of Minnesota; John Kenneth Galbraith, ADAer and former speech writer to Adlai Stevenson.

● Recent issues of *The Worker*, official mouthpiece of the Communist party, have carried advertisements announcing the inception of something called the "Prometheus" book club. Its first offering: *The Power Elite*, by left-wing Columbia professor C. Wright Mills, who is currently playing a major role in the drive to force American policy into the channels of appeasement (see "Mit Der Dummheit," by William Henry Chamberlin, in Article Section I of this issue).

Good Government Society: Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss and Senator John L. McClellan (D.-Ark.) will receive awards at the annual George Washington Dinner of the American Good Government Society, in the Sheraton-Park Hotel, April 30. Delivering the main address will be Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.). Other speakers will be Senator Harry Byrd (D.-Va.) and Representative Charles Halleck (R.-Ind.). Tickets: $20 per person, from American Good Government Society, 810 Dupont Circle Building, Washington 6, D. C.

The Editorial Mind: In its article "McCarthyism Revisited," by Richard Whalen (February 11, 1959), HUMAN EVENTS carried commentary on a recently published survey of opinion among college professors, *The Academic Mind*. This article neglected to include information as to the publisher and the price of the book. *The Academic Mind* is published by The Free Press, Inc., Glencoe, Illinois. It may be obtained from the publishers for $6 per copy.

EDUCATORS LAUD HUMAN EVENTS

MEDFORD EVANS, Department of Social Sciences, Northwestern State College of Louisiana: "I find HUMAN EVENTS particularly useful for my classes relating to government and politics."

HERBERT SMITH, President of Willamette University: "I am delighted to receive the sound statement of opinion on current events presented by HUMAN EVENTS. I think the distribution of such ideas to the college campus is important, in view of the many influences of the opposite kind which pervade classrooms."

W. F. WATTS, Head of Department of English, Parsons College: "HUMAN EVENTS is timely, interesting and very much alive. Valuable information on one important viewpoint from which the current scene may be contemplated."

K. P. KOEPPEL, Department of Business Administration, Pasadena College: "This is the finest publication I know about. I agree with the general tenor of HUMAN EVENTS and appreciate receiving it."

MSGR. D. V. FOLEY, President, Loras College: "An excellent publication—HUMAN EVENTS is one of the very best."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* — JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 10 HUMAN EVENTS March 11, 1959

Article Section I

'Mit Der Dummheit'

Appeasing the Unappeasable: US Road to Ruin

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

"*Mit der dummheit kaempfen Goetter selbst vergebens.*" ("With stupidity the gods themselves contend in vain.") This observation of Schiller, in his "Maid of Orleans," seems especially applicable to the campaign of appeasement and defeatism that is going on in this country, just as Soviet dictator Nikita Khrushchev is showing himself to be as aggressive, truculent and unappeasable as his predecessor, Josef Stalin.

Appeasement and defeatism are not openly advocated, of course; the respectable camouflage words are "flexibility" and "realism." But on examination flexibility always turns out to be a one-way street, giving in to Soviet or Red Chinese demands without exacting any equivalent concessions. And realism boils down to a pessimistic belief that, as we cannot stand up to Soviet pressure, we had better give in as gracefully as possible to this pressure, whether it is exercised in Quemoy or in Berlin.

The effect of this campaign on American national morale, on the clear thinking and resolution which are especially necessary when a crafty and dangerous enemy is continually on the offensive, should not be underestimated.

There is big money back of it, as frequent expensive advertisements in *The New York Times* and other publications indicates. It is backed by an intensive letter-writing drive. Among its leading sponsors are a very wealthy industrialist, a well-known syndicated columnist, a number of professorial pundits. It has some powerful political patronage. And it derives considerable momentum from the short memories of too many Americans, and their inability to learn anything from the lessons of history, even of very recent history.

Running through this propaganda for one-sided concessions and unilateral retreat one finds three spoken or unspoken assumptions:

- The cold war is mainly, if not entirely, the fault and responsibility of the United States.
- The only obstacle to peace and understanding with the Communist masters of Moscow and Peiping is American inflexibility and lack of understanding.
- It is within the power of the United States, by accepting all or part of the Communist demands, to bring about an honorable and enduring peace.

All these assumptions are so demonstrably false that one can only fall back on the lines of Schiller in an effort to understand how literate, sometimes well educated persons, with free access to available sources of information, can believe in their validity. Part of the explanation doubtless lies in the hysteria about nuclear warfare which seems to have reached its highest pitch in England, but which has also affected some individuals in the United States.

Consider for a moment the origins and the course of the cold war. It is doubtful whether ever in history one side was so obviously and continuously on the offensive, the other so persistently committed, at best, to passive defense. There would have been, in all probability, no cold war, no arms race, no American overseas bases, troops in Europe or naval forces in the Mediterranean, if Stalin had remained content with the ample Soviet frontiers of 1939.

It was the enormous Soviet territorial expansion, achieved partly by direct annexation, partly by the imposition of made-in-Moscow Communist governments on the unwilling peoples of Eastern Europe, accompanied by repeated violations of treaties and wartime pledges, that impelled the United States to take measures for the defense of what remained of the free world. Since the end of the war every act of overt aggression has come from the Soviet side: the incitation of civil war in Greece, the blockade of West Berlin, the invasion of Korea, the crisis in the Formosa Straits.

WHETHER THIS IS to our credit or not, it is certainly a fact that there is not one instance when the United States used military force, or even supplied munitions, for the overthrow of a Communist regime in a country where it was established. The history of American-Soviet relations since 1945 has been one of continual aggression and provocation on one side, of purely defensive action on the other.

If the idea that the United States is largely to blame for the cold war is without foundation, this is equally the case as regards the idea that Khrushchev is willing to call it off on reasonable terms. Would a statesman who seriously desired reconcilation and "coexistence" have recklessly committed his prestige to a demand for an arbitrary change of the existing situation in Germany? Would a government that wanted to tread the paths of peace threaten a militarily much weaker neighbor, Iran, with being "treated as an enemy"? What about such blunt declarations of ultimate purpose as Khrushchev's boast, "We will bury you," hurled at departing Western diplomats who were leaving one of his receptions because of his insults, or his more recent repeated threats of missile warfare?

Yet, in the face of this overwhelming body of evidence as to Soviet responsibility for the cold war and determination to carry it on until the world is won for communism, a groundswell of appeasement has been making its appearance. At the height of the Quemoy crisis last autumn *The New York Times* published a large advertisement headed, "AMERICA NEEDS A NEW FOREIGN POLICY," containing the following statements:

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Though we are loaded with arms and have laid great store by the deterrent effect of threatened retaliation.

"Communism has not been contained.

"Democracy has not been extended.

"A position of strength has not been achieved.

"We find ourselves trapped in tight corners where we desperately assume rigid positions that make negotiation virtually impossible."

The signatories of this manifesto—including Eleanor Roosevelt, Norman Thomas, James P. Warburg and Professors C. Wright Mills and D. F. Fleming (of whom more hereafter)—apparently did not consider whether the position of America and of the free countries generally would have been better if we had neglected our arms. Nor did they have any word of criticism of Soviet "rigid positions."

More recently, with the time-bomb of the Soviet ultimatum on Berlin ticking away, this same group (with a few changes of names) came up with the following positive recommendations to the new Congress:

Abandon nuclear weapons tests; encourage the demilitarization of tension areas; invite the Soviet Government to enter into an agreement with us to reject war and the threat of war as an instrument of policy; admit Red China to the United Nations; increase economic aid to other countries, channeling it through the UN.

In other words: unilateral disarmament, creation of the "demilitarized" vacuum of which Communist powers always take advantage; seek still another pledge from the Soviet Union, which has already dishonored scores of obligations; encourage our foes and discourage our friends in Asia; and give away more of our substance through the UN, which includes some enemy powers and a good many unfriendly neutrals.

Mit der dummheit . . .

IN A BOOK entitled *The Causes of World War Three,* Professor C. Wright Mills throws most of the blame for this impending catastrophe on Secretary Dulles and a sinister product of the professor's lively imagination: "the American power elite." His program for peace?

"The United States should cease all testing of nuclear devices . . . should at once and unilaterally cease all further production of 'extermination' weapons . . . should abandon all military bases and installations outside the continental domain of the United States." For good measure it should encourage our European allies to disarm "unilaterally and immediately." Program for peace? Or for national suicide?

Another professor, D. F. Fleming, who teaches world politics at Vanderbilt University, reproaches America for objecting to unlimited expansion of the Soviet Union's Western and Southern borders, in complete disregard of the fact that such expansion upsets the world balance of power and means slavery for peoples who have every right to an independent existence. The professor sees the desirability of eliminating "friction points such as Quemoy and West Berlin, which are obviously intolerable to our opponents."

It is always we, one notes, who are supposed to give way; how about suggesting, for a change, that the blocking of German reunion in freedom by Soviet maintenance of a Red Quisling regime in its zone of occupation is "intolerable" to *us*?

Walter Lippmann, who can always be relied on to bring the leaden weight of his pontifical style to support propositions tending toward appeasement, defeatism and retreat (he made the welkin ring with anguished cries of what would happen if we didn't pull the rug from under Chiang Kai-shek in Quemoy) chips in with the suggestion that the Soviet idea of a phony German confederation is practical politics, while the Western demand for free elections as the basis of German reunion is not. In all his writing on Germany Lippmann seems to proceed on the preposterous assumption that the Soviet puppet regime could negotiate independently with the fully representative Government of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. This same absurdity, among others, is to be found in Senator Mansfield's most unfortunate venture into spelling out conditions for a settlement of the German question.

Still another figure in the campaign for promoting appeasement is a prominent industrialist, Cyrus Eaton. He was partly responsible for the warm reception which Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan, deeply implicated in the assassination of Hungarian liberty, received from some business groups in the Middle West. He has promoted cosy get-togethers of Soviet and American atomic scientists. He mixes frequent praise of Soviet economic progress and "love of peace" with denunciations of his own country's foreign policy, and he is on record as saying in a Soviet publication, *International Affairs*:

"In the Soviet Union the Government speaks in the name of all the people. In the United States this is not the case. It does not speak in the name of the people."

Despite all his blustering tough talk, it seems unlikely that Nikita Khrushchev deliberately intends to resort to an atomic holocaust to achieve his designs in Berlin and elsewhere. But the Lippmanns, the Eatons, the well-meaning misguided people who sign manifestoes in favor of unilateral disarmament and one-sided concessions, are giving him a powerful assist. Unless their activity is counteracted and discredited by a powerful upsurge of realistic patriotism, it could be that Khrushchev will think we are softer and weaker than we are, and make a fatal miscalculation as to how far we can be pushed around.

Mit der dummheit. . . .

William Henry Chamberlin is a prominent journalist and author of many books and articles on foreign affairs. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "Letter to an Isolationalist," December 29, 1958.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "MIT DER DUMMHEIT" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 10 HUMAN EVENTS March 11, 1959

Article Section II

A "reaction" against tyranny

I've Been Called a Name

By JOHN J. SYNON

I DO A column for a downstate daily whose publisher recently told me I am one of the most "reactionary" characters he's ever known.

He runs my stuff, I think, because he gets a kick out of the occasional blue furies I manage whenever my nape is rubbed the wrong way. My low flash point, he says, stirs up his readers. Which is reason enough for him to print me—he sells papers for a living. But why call me a reactionary?

Literally, I suppose I am. Who isn't? Only the dead don't react.

Yet the stinging phrase rings in my ears, for there is nothing hidebound about me. Certainly I'm against indiscriminate foreign aid. Who in his right mind isn't—bucketing dollars all over the world like madmen slopping a billion hogs? And, yes, I am opposed to compulsory unionism. I think it outrageous, this forcing people against their will into private organizations. Conceding these views, are they enough to pin a label on me?

What is the definition of a "reactionary"? I don't know and I can't find out. I can tell you what an egghead is, a New Dealer, a Mugwump, a Know Nothing. I even remember what Democrats were. But I've never seen a definition of a political reactionary, one I'd accept.

I keep plowing around for a definition, for some little succinct phrase that will salve my editor-bruised feelings, but I can't find one. The best I can do is much too long. By whatever title, this is my creed: *You let me alone and I'll let you alone.*

Does that make me a reactionary? I call my publisher friend a socialist and I can prove, by Webster's dictionary, that he's a socialist. On the other hand, he calls himself a Democrat but I defy him to prove that.

I call myself a Republican, and when I want to emphasize what I am I call myself a "black Republican." I do that even though the blood of my Virginia relatives changes cycle whenever I do. The Republican party was born to free men, our black people, and because I haven't forgot that historical fact I call myself—despite the wincing of those who are forced to associate with me—I call myself a Black Republican.

I remember how my party came into being and I couldn't be anything else, for I believe with all my heart that every man should be free, the captain of his soul. Which, parenthetically, is why I oppose compulsory unionism. And since we prefer an orderly society (I suppose we prefer civilization), with freedom must go responsibility. The two are inexorably coupled. What sort of "freedom" is it when a person shucks responsibility? Somebody must assume the burden you dodge and if you refuse it, then you must—to maintain order—take direction from another.

The socialists press for the abdication of responsibility, of personal liberty. They say, in return, you shall have a "planned economy." This is a euphemism, you must know, for a much plainer phrase. It means, "let uncle tell you what to do."

Who's uncle? "Uncle" is a bunch of egghead jerks who have no understanding of your problems as an individual and care less. They look at "the broad picture," and you with your problems at home and at the butcher shop have no meaning.

Today they set the price of your pork chops and of your milk and they do it so as to make them prohibitively costly. How long since the butcher has given you a savory soupbone for "the dog"? Or a peppermint stick for junior? And the "sales" Mama once knew are things long gone. There was a day when shopping, next to the honeymoon, was the greatest thrill in Mama's life. That bargain hunter par excellence could, in two days of cagy foraging, save Papa half the bill.

No longer. They've got Mama fair-traded nigh into schizophrenia.

WHEN I WAS a boy, before the era of the Common Man, a workman labored and was paid. And what he got was his, brother, all his, for he had earned it. The man who worked for wages had no more connection with the tax collector than presently he has with Sputnik.

When I was a boy, a man who worked for wages had heard of the tax collector, sure, but gave him no personal application for he knew no direct taxation and the indirect bite was so small as to make it inconsequential. Government meant little to him.

What happened? The man who presently works for wages, even the poorest, works three months every year, just to feed that insatiable Moloch, the

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Federal Government. The best he can expect in return is something they call "social security." And, yes, you guessed it, I'm against that, too.

I don't remember the exact figures, I'm no statistician, yet I recall, for every dollar Joe the Drudge pays in he will take out 30, maybe 20, I don't know, some outlandish sum. There is nothing equal to that this side of Reno. Think of it, 30-to-one. Even the racetracks don't pay off like that, more than once or twice a meet—not if they want to stay in business. Then how does the Federal Government do it?

Easy. They've got the "broad picture" in mind so they steal it by the billions from others—and from the very "beneficiaries" they pay it to. Already the thing is dishing out more than it is taking in, and in the future the outgo will mount until the difference becomes astronomical. And where will the difference come from?

Why, through greater and greater taxation, by floated Government paper, paid for by a depreciated currency—where else?

And yet this thing was sold to the people, is being sold now, as a form of insurance. I oppose social security as we know it because I am opposed to my Government working a confidence game on the people.

That makes me a reactionary. So be it.

Every dispassionate person who ever tried to teach me something of life told me liberty is the greatest treasure of them all. And every bit of history I've ever read hammers home their meaning. I remembered their words in the 20's, when the Russian peasants by the millions starved to death because they were not allowed to fend for themselves.

And I remembered when our State Department issued its White Paper trying to make me believe the Red Chinese were agrarian reformers, and I remembered and cheered the courage of the Free Chinese when Chiang threw out old Vinegar Joe Stilwell. And later, in Laos and across the world in East Berlin and a bit later in Hungary, I remembered.

I remembered the words of Patrick Henry and never felt them outmoded. And I don't think them outmoded now, reactionary though I may be.

How can a person forget? Having remembered as the lights of the world grew dim, how can I forget as I see our homegrown tyrants stealing upon my own personal freedom? I can't, nor shall I. For it makes little difference to me how you steal my liberty so long as you steal it.

What essential difference is there between a labor camp and forced membership in a trade union? There is only a difference in degree, for in neither case is the individual allowed to exercise his "inalienable" right of free choice.

And to this I react.

I have no mind to harp on labor unions, to the exclusion of other infringers on our liberty. Their counterparts, the employers who conspire with union bosses to bilk the consumer, are no better. As the labor chiefs drive to compel every wage earner to join their ranks, so businessmen sometimes tell the bosses to cut down the number of firms in an industry, so that those left—those playing ball with the unions—can charge monopoly-sized prices.

There is but one hope, there has always been but one hope, and that is in the fight for the rights of the individual.

We must never quit.

If we give way to the cynic and wait for the axe to fall, then indeed there is no hope. For a number of reasons, material and moral, we have to keep on fighting. And if they beat us today, we'll beat them tomorrow.

I have no desire to be a plush-cushion slave, as enticing as that may sound, for such slaves—having no voice of their own—have a way of losing their cushions. After all, these eggheads who do the "planning" are incapable of creating anything, and unless you create for them they won't have the wherewithal to slake old Moloch's thirst.

When the planners have reached the last farthing of your earned dollar, what then? Who is going to do the creating? Not me—there is nothing in it for me. And not you either, and for the very same reason. Yet the day will come when the last cent is controlled, unless we fight on.

This land of ours was built on hope and certain assurances. If a man worked, produced, he could keep what he earned, do as he pleased so long as he did not impinge on another. This was the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, the fireball that lit liberty's torch, that brought us to the top of the heap. Without hope of gain for effort expended, there is no hope. And without hope, no life worth the living.

Reactionary, indeed.

John J. Synon, is a California Industrial Accident Commissioner. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "A Southern President?" August 4, 1958.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "I'VE BEEN CALLED A NAME" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED